

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending. By this Amendment, the specification and claims 1, 6 and 15 are amended. No new matter has been added.

Applicants thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended to Applicants' representative during the December 15, 2005 telephone interview. The points discussed and the agreements reached are incorporated into the amendments and to the Remarks below and constitute the Applicants' record of the interview. It was agreed during the telephone interview the rejections will be withdrawn.

The specification at paragraphs 26, 27, 29, 30 and 46 are amended to overcome the 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph rejection, as agreed during the telephone interview. Support for the amendments to claims 1, 6 and 15 are found throughout the specification, drawing figures, and original claims as filed.

For the following reasons, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections as agreed during the telephone interview are respectfully requested.

I. REPLY TO REJECTIONS

A. 35 U.S.C. §112, First Paragraph

On page 2, item 3 of the August 11, 2005 Office Action, claims 6, 8, 10, 11, 15 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

It was confirmed in the telephone interview that as indicated in the November 28, 2005 Advisory Action, the rejection of claims 6, 8 and 10 will be withdrawn based on the argument submitted with the November 5, 2005 Request for Reconsideration. As to claims 11, 15 and 20, paragraphs [0026], [0027], [0029], [0030] and [0046] are amended to overcome the rejection as agreed during the telephone interview. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

B. 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

On page 3, items 5-7 of the Office Action, claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0251460 to Lee et al. (hereinafter "Lee").

Claims 1, 6 and 15 are amended. As agreed during the telephone interview, the amendments define claims 1, 6 and 15, and their respective dependent claims, over Lee. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

II. CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney, **Seth S. Kim**, at the telephone number listed below.


To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this,

Serial No. **10/797,073**

Docket No. **K-0704 (Formerly MRE-0070)**

concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP



John C. Eisenhart
Registration No. 38,128
Seth S. Kim
Registration No. 54,577

P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200
703 766-3701 DYK/JCE/SSK:knv
Date: December 28, 2005

Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610

\\fk4\Documents\2016\2016-752\81365.doc